

REMARKS

This is in full and timely response to the above-identified Office Action. Reexamination and reconsideration in light of the proposed amendments and the following remarks are respectfully requested.

Rejections

- A) Claims 1, 4 and 10-15 stand rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by any one of Kokubo (JP'370), Varanasi et al. and Iwasa (JP'177).

This rejection is rendered moot by the cancellation of claim 1 and the amendment of claims 3-5, 10, 12, 14 and 16 to depend from claim 2 which has been amended to assume independent form.

- B) Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 USC § 103 as being allegedly obvious in light of Varanasi et al., Nozaki et al. or Seo et al.

In this rejection it appears that the Varanasi et al. reference is applied only with respect to claims 19 and 20. It further appears that Nozaki alone is applied with respect to the photoresist composition and that Seo et al. is not relied upon at all. Further, it is not clear if the three references which are cited in the rejection are applied individually, or in combination.

This rejection states that Nozaki et al. discloses a photoresist composition comprising as additives unpolymerized compounds found in column 31, lines 36 – column 33, line 5 wherein these compounds disclose structures which anticipate the claimed second compound of claim 1, (see compound (XLVI)). The rejection then states that Nozaki et al. lacks the presence of the unpolymerized compound used in an explicit example in a photo resist composition. (Emphasis added)

To overcome this admitted shortcoming, the rejection then states that it would have been obvious to use any of the listed compounds in column 31, line 36 – column 33, line 5 with a dissolution inhibitor, a base resin and an acid generator in the photo resist compound with a reasonable expectation of the same or similar results as recited in Nozaki et al.

However, in traverse, it is pointed out the subject matter of claim 2 is not anticipated by compound XLVI of Nozaki et al. (implicitly acknowledged by the absence of any anticipation of claim 2 in rejection A) and that the rejection does not contain anything that would suggest that the subject matter of claim 2 is either known or suggested by the disclosure of Nozaki et al. or either of the other two references which are cited in this rejection.

The rejection of claims 2-20 which remain in this application is therefore respectfully traversed.

C) Claims 1, 4 and 10-13 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seo et al.

This rejection is rendered moot by the cancellation of claim 1.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the above claim amendments overcome the rejections which have been made in this Office Action. Favorable reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of this application are therefore respectfully requested. Should any outstanding issues remain, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned telephonically so that resolution of these matters can be expedited.

Date June 9, 2003

FOLEY & LARDNER  
Customer Number: 22428



22428

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

Telephone: (202) 672-5327

Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

Respectfully submitted,

By

William T. Ellis  
Registration No. 26,674  
Keith J. Townsend  
Registration No. 40,358